

Applicant: Stuart M. Gleman
Serial No: 10/074,826
Page 14

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated May 13, 2003. In that Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings and Abstract. Claims 1-9 and 11-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murphy U.S. Patent No. 5,227,797 ("Murphy"). Claims 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy. Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schaefer. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of the claims and offers the foregoing amendments and following remarks in support thereof.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings, specification and abstract. Applicant has amended the drawings, specification and abstract to overcome the Examiner's objections. Amended drawing figures 2-3 and formal drawings 4-6 are enclosed. The original Abstract has been added to the Summary of the Invention section.

Claims 1-7, 14-17, 21-32, 36 and 37 have been amended. No new matter has been inserted. Claims 1-39 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections.

Both the Murphy and Schaefer patents receive reflected or deflected signals. Neither reference passes a portion of the signal through the object, nor does either reference receive the passed through portion of the transmitted signal by a means for receiving located on an opposite side of the object from the side that the signal is transmitted from. Murphy also fails to teach of transmitting more than one signal at the object at the same time with each signal transmitted at a different frequency from the other transmitted signals.

Additionally, duplexer 16 of Murphy is merely a switch not a

Applicant: Stuart M. Gleman
Serial No: 10/074,826
Page 15

beam generator as alleged by the Examiner. Murphy's duplexer 16 switches an antenna from a transmitting mode to a receiving mode. This allows a single antenna to be used for transmitting and receiving the signal, since the received signal is achieved from deflecting/reflecting the transmitted signal off the object.

Murphy also fails to provide for a continuous wave as claimed in Claim 3 and 24.

Murphy also fails to perform the signal ratio calculation claimed by Applicant.

Murphy also fails to discuss of auxiliary detectors as claimed by Applicant, and merely discloses a single antenna for receiving, whether the antenna is the same as or independent from the transmitting antenna in Murphy.

Applicant has completely responded to the Office Action dated May 13, 2003. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Any additional charges, including Extensions of Time, please bill our Deposit Account No. 13-1130.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel S. Polley, Reg. No. 34,902
Malin, Haley & DiMaggio, P.A.
1936 South Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316
(954) 763-3303

CUSTOMER NO. 22235